



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,243	05/02/2005	Tsutomu Sanaka	KPO-JMS-P1/SH-72/US	2622

44702 7590 07/13/2007  
OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY & BROITMAN PC  
570 LEXINGTON AVENUE  
FLOOR 17  
NEW YORK, NY 10022-6894

EXAMINER
----------

ISSAC, ROY P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1623

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/13/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication:

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/520,243

Applicant(s)

SANAKA ET AL.

Examiner

Roy P. Issac

Art Unit

1623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration..
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8 and 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 1623

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This application is a 371 of PCT/JP03/06453, filed 05/23/2003 and claims priority under 35 U.S.C §119 (a)-(d) and 365(c) to foreign application Japan 2002-192177 filed 07/01/2002. A certified copy of foreign priority application in Japanese is received. A translation of the foreign application is received. A preliminary amendment filed 1/01/2005 in which claims 1-15 are newly submitted is acknowledged. Claims 1-15 are currently pending and are examined on the merits herein.

### ***Attorney Interview Summary***

A telephone interview was initiated by attorney Mannette Dennis on 13 June 2007. Attorney Dennis informed that the previous office action, filed 5/04/2007, was based on a claim set that was submitted as part of the foreign priority translation. As such, the office action filed 05/04/2007 is withdrawn, and a new office action is enclosed herein.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 8-9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bartz et. al. (AU 615553; PTO-1449, dated 3/16/2005).

Bartz et. al. discloses solutions for intraperitoneal administration comprising taurine. (Page 1, Claim 1). Bartz et. al. further discloses compositions comprising taurine (4.9 g/l = 0.49 w/v%), sodium lactate (48 mmol/l), sodium chloride (5.785 g/l = 99 mmol/l), calcium chloride dihydrate (0.2573 g/l = 1.75 mmol/l), magnesium chloride (0.1017 g/l = 0.5 mmol/l) and a pH value of 5.6. (Example 1, Pages 10-11). The osmotic pressure of the solution was disclosed as 500 mOsm/l. (Example 1, Page 11). Bartz et. al. further discloses that the solution can have pH in the 5.5 to 6.5 range. (Page 9, Paragraph 4). Taurine (4.9 g/l) falls within the range of 0.01 to 5 w/v% claimed herein. The addition of electrolytes containing sodium, potassium, calcium or magnesium ions is disclosed. (Page 7, last paragraph). Preferred ion concentrations of 125 to 150 mmol/l of sodium ion, 0.5 to 2 mmol/l calcium ion and 0 to 2.5 mmol/l of magnesium ion. Note that mEq/L and mmol/l are the same for monovalent ions such as sodium. For divalent ions, such as calcium and magnesium mEq/l is calculated by dividing mmol/l by two. Note that the recitation, "a peritoneal dialysate" is considered

Art Unit: 1623

the intended use of the composition. Note that it is well settled that "intended use" of a composition or product, e.g., "peritoneal dialysate", will not further limit claims drawn to a composition or product, so long as the prior art discloses the same composition comprising the same ingredients in an effective amount, as the instantly claimed. See, e.g., *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987) and *In re Hack* 114, USPQ 161. As such, claims 1-7 are deemed anticipated by Bartz et. al.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartz et. al. (AU 615553; PTO-1449, dated 3/16/2005).

The disclosure of Bartz et. al. is discussed above.

Bartz et. al. does not exemplify a composition within the pH ranges of 6.0 to 7.5 or the particular concentration of 25 to 45 mEq/L of sodium lactate.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make peritoneal dialysate composition containing taurine, sodium lactate, sodium ion, calcium ion, magnesium ion, chloride ion and glucose having a pH of 6.0 to 7.5 because Bartz et. al. broadly discloses dialysates for intraperitoneal administration comprising the same ingredients ranges falling within or

Art Unit: 1623

similar to the compositions claimed herein. Furthermore, it is expected that the solution of Bartz et. al. will achieve physiological pH range "upon use" overlapping the claimed range herein.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make a compositions containing taurine, sodium lactate, sodium ion, calcium ion, magnesium ion, chloride ion and glucose having a pH of 6.0 to 7.5 because Bartz et. al. broadly discloses dialysates for intraperitoneal administration comprising the same ingredients ranges falling within or similar to the compositions claimed herein. It has been held that it is within the skill in the art to select optimal parameters, such as amounts of ingredients, in a composition in order to achieve a beneficial effect. See *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably expected that the compositions of the instant application would have had substantially similar of better effects.

Thus the claimed invention as a whole is clearly prima facie obvious over the combined teachings of the prior art.

No claim is allowed.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roy P. Issac whose telephone number is 571-272-2674. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 1623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia Anna Jiang can be reached on 571-272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Roy P. Issac  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1623

  
S. Anna Jiang, Ph.D.  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1623